

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

CYNTHIA R. THOMPSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	NO. CIV-13-1008-HE
)	
SHARON HARRISON, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Plaintiff, a state prisoner appearing *pro se*, filed a complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging violations of her constitutional rights. She filed a motion seeking leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“*ifp*”), but failed to include a certified copy of her institutional account’s statement for the preceding six-month period. The court directed plaintiff to provide that information and granted her several extensions of time within which to do it. By order entered on January 6, 2014, plaintiff was granted one final extension, until **January 17, 2014**, to provide her account statement. However, she failed to submit the information needed for the court to determine whether she may proceed *ifp*. Instead, she has sent the court a letter, filed an amended complaint and filed another motion asking the court for relief it is not authorized to provide.


Plaintiff seems to be proceeding under the misconception that all she has to do is file a complaint and then she can ask the court to take care of any problems or requests she has, such as providing her with a copy of her birth certificate. Plaintiff is mistaken. As she has filed a § 1983 action, the court can only remedy constitutional or statutory violations to

which that statute is directed.

Because plaintiff has neither paid the filing fee nor provided the court with the documentation it needs to determine whether plaintiff may proceed *ifp*, the court has no choice but to dismiss this action. Accordingly, this action is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. Plaintiff's motions [Doc. Nos. 28, 30] are **STRICKEN as being MOOT**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 22nd day of January, 2014.



JOE HEATON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE